

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COLUMBIA DIVISION

Thurmond R. Guess, Sr.)	C/A NO. 3:15-657-CMC-PJG
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	OPINION and ORDER
v.)	
)	
David Adams, <i>as Richland County Treasurer</i> ;)	
Shirley S. Tapp,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

This matter is before the court on Petitioner’s Motion to Alter or Amend Judgment pursuant to Rule 59(e). ECF No. 39.

The Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals has interpreted Rule 59(e) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to allow the court to alter or amend an earlier judgment: “(1) to accommodate an intervening change in controlling law; (2) to account for new evidence not available at trial; or (3) to correct a clear error of law or prevent manifest injustice.” *Becker v. Westinghouse Savannah River Co.*, 305 F.3d 284, 290 (4th Cir. 2002) (quoting *Pac. Ins. Co. v. Am. Nat’l Fire Ins. Co.*, 148 F.3d 396, 403 (4th Cir. 1998)). “Mere disagreement does not support a Rule 59(e) motion.” *Id.* (quoting *Hutchinson v. Stanton*, 994 F.2d 1076, 1082 (4th Cir. 1993)).

Petitioner’s motion consists of nine bare-bones allegations that this court’s ruling violated various rules, statutes, cases, and Constitutional Amendments. ECF No. 39. None of these nine points contains any argument or explanation of how these standards were violated. Further, the Motion contains no argument as to the Rule 59(e) requirements needed to justify an alteration or amendment to this court’s Order.

Petitioner's one-page Reply contains only conclusory allegations with no facts cited in support. ECF No. 41. Attached to Petitioner's Reply are various documents related to his state court action and action in this court. However, Petitioner's Reply does not enumerate how these documents support the allegations in his Reply. Neither Petitioner's Motion nor Reply contains any explanation or argument regarding how his allegations contained within meet the standard for altering or amending the earlier judgment.

Petitioner has not made the showing required to meet the threshold for grant of a Motion to Alter or Amend under Rule 59(e). Therefore, Petitioner's motion to alter or amend is **denied**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Cameron McGowan Currie
CAMERON MCGOWAN CURRIE
Senior United States District Judge

Columbia, South Carolina
January 28, 2016